DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 173 CS 507 749

AUTHOR Martinson, Jay
TITLE High School Principals and Students: Negotiating Deviant Behavior through Politeness.
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (77th, Atlanta, GA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; *Assistant Principals; Communication Research; *Discipline; *Discourse Analysis; Educational Environment; High Schools; High School Students; *Principals; *Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Behavior; *Communication Strategies; Deviance; Illinois (Central); Politeness; School Culture; Student Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

A study examined natural dialogue between high school disciplinarians (principals, deans, assistant principals) and students in disciplinary situations. Four disciplinarians (two men and two women--two assistant principals, one principal, and one dean) representing three schools in central Illinois audiotaped as few or as many complete dialogues with students as they felt comfortable doing. Tape recorders were within sight of the students. Of the 45 dialogues generated, 12 were transcribed in their entirety. Portions of three other dialogues were transcribed, and the rest of the 45 dialogues were played and reviewed. Each utterance was analyzed using P. Brown and S. C. Levinson's politeness strategies in order to determine the utterance's function in the negotiating process. Results indicated that, without exception, the disciplinarians made attempts to minimize the threat associated with acceptance of deviant behavior as a face-threatening situation. Results also indicated that students played a vital role in the degree to which the disciplinarian incorporated politeness strategies: cooperative students received more off-record strategies and more positive-face redress, while uncooperative students tended to receive more coercive utterances along with less indirectness and positive-face redress. An epilogue discusses issues raised in one of the dialogues in which a female, minority student interacted with a white school administrator. (Portions of the transcripts are included; 20 references and a list of politeness strategies are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343173

High school principals and students: Negotiating deviant behavior through politeness

Jay Martinson

University of Illinois

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Martinson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS507749

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Before any disciplinary action can ever be delivered to a student, the disciplinarian and student enter a process of negotiation. The purpose of this study was to analyze natural dialogue between high school disciplinarians (principals, deans, assistant principals) and students in disciplinary situations. They must negotiate the behavior in question and its label of deviance. Rather than attaching macro-labels to whole interactions, this paper assesses the various levels of, and student responses to face-protection strategies employed by disciplinarians within the negotiation process. It also identifies and describes interaction patterns found within the analyzed data. An epilogue is offered which addresses a specific dialogue, offers analysis, and calls for increased sensitivity toward cultural differences.

When a child is to receive discipline from an adult in a face-to-face encounter, a pattern of interaction can be discerned. The design of discipline messages has been widely examined in the family context (Brunk and Henggeler 1984, Chapman 1978, Chapman 1981, Chapman and Zahn-Waxler 1981, Smith 1983, Porte, Dunham & Williams 1986, Grusec & Kuczynski, 1980, Kuczynski 1984, etc.). With the almost exclusive use of experimental situations, these studies have assessed the various strategies which parents use or 'would use' in discipline situations. Specifically, these studies examine issues of power-assertion, love-withdrawal, child-compliance and emotional acceptance. Selection of disciplinary strategy by an adult appears to be influenced by several independent variables including socio-cognitive ability, socio-economic status, gender, gender of target, and educational background.

Chapman (1981) forwarded the notion that parental behavior sometimes appears to be conditioned by immediate stimuli and responses of the child when, in reality, they may be determined by the goals and expectations that they bring to the interaction. Testing this idea, Kuczynski (1984) conducted a study involving mothers and their children in a laboratory setting. Rather than adapting discipline strategies to meet child responses, he pointed to parental goals of short or long-term behavior change as strategy determinants. He discovered reasoning (as opposed to power assertion) was likely to be used as a strategy for promoting long-term compliance in children.

Counter to Chapman's (1981) assertion, Brunk and Henggeler (1984) proposed that parent/child disciplinary interactions were effected by immediate responses of the child. In that study, they tested Bell's (1968, 1971, 1974, 1977) theory of bidirectionality, in which interactants serve to maintain the interpersonal system in equilibrium. Using adults interacting with 10 year old confederates, the found support for bidirectionality. A child trained to appear withdrawn or incompetent was likely to evoke encouragement and coaxing when failing to cooperate in a given task. An aggressive, impulsive child was likely to evoke commands, thus restoring 'equilibrium'.

The methods in this body of reviewed research seem problematic. Most of these studies, despite their different claims, reduce whole interactions into one general category of 'strategy used'. Adults were determined, for example to have taken an 'other-centered' approach, or a 'high degree of control' approach. In such analyses, the dynamics within the interaction tend to be overlooked.

Also problematic is the experimental conditions under which interactions took place. Situations requiring discipline were manipulated, thus lacking much personal investment on the part those involved. Analyzed interactions were not occuring naturally. When participants left the laboratory, they did not have to 'live with' the results of their manipulated interactions. Children confederates faced no real consequences from their interaction other than receiving monetary compensation.

The present study focusses on the high school disciplinary interaction for several reasons. All of the research reviewed

involved young children. Parallel disciplinary interaction research involving parent/adolescent or disciplinarian/student dyads was not found. This study extends the research into the realm of adolescence. The interactions between trained disciplinarians and students is a clearly defined context for observing disciplinary interaction. The setting is also a natural one. Most reviewed literature invoked experimental conditions within a laboratory. This study examined actual, non-manipulated interactions, which all occurred during school hours within the offices of participating disciplinarians' offices. Further, the tendency of reviewed research was to categorize whole interactions as being examples of one distinct strategy. Here, conversational analysis of transcripts is employed to identify subtle dynamics occurring within while interactions.

A major premise directing this study is that both disciplinarian and their senior high adolescents possess certain adult personality features. Among these features include their desire to be free from imposition. They seek a positive self-image and the desire for it to be appreciated by others, and the rational capacity to employ means toward achieving desired ends. Granting this assumption, one can expect at least some degree of attention given toward protecting these desires, or one's 'face'. High school disciplinarians have a difficult task. Before administering a punishment, they must first establish and preferrably gain agreement on a definition of some focal behavior as deviant. Disciplinarians' strategies for dealing with this task are explored

through Brown and Levinson's (1987) theoretical framework of face protection.

Assessing face-threat and redress

Brown and Levinson's (1987) description of 'face' and types of politeness are summarized in this section of the paper. Face is something that is emotionally invested, it can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and it must be constantly attended to in interaction. People generally cooperate in maintaining one another's face. Since people can be expected to defend their faces if threatened, it is generally in the participants' best interests to maintain each others' face. Face can be described as the self-image which all people desire to protect. The two kinds of face addresed by Brown and Levinson are negative face and positive face. Negative face is the desire for one's actions to be unimpeded by others. Positive face is the desire of every member that his wants and desires be desirable to at least some others. The use of negative face politeness conveys the speaker's desire not to infringe upon the hearer. The use of positive face politeness conveys an appreciation of the hearer's wants and desires in general or to the expression of similarity between speakers and hearers wants and desires. Positive face politeness protects the face of the hearer by indicating that in some respects, the speaker represents or recognizes the hearer's wants or desires (i.e. by treating him as a member of an in-group, a friend, a person whose wants and personality traits are known and liked).

Some acts intrinsically threaten face and these are referred to as 'face threatening acts' (FTAs). For the most part, speakers needing or wanting to be polite will minimize any particular FTA. The more an act threatens the speaker's or hearer's face, the more the speaker will want to choose a greater face face-protection strategy. The use of such face-protection is referred to as 'redress'.

Three variables which Brown & Levinson identify as influencing the degree of face-saving strategy one will likely choose include social distance (D), power (P), and the cultural ranking of the imposition (R). A small D (little social distance) is associated with the giving and receiving of positive politeness as between friends or those of equal status. A great P (power) differential is associated with less politeness strategies, as between a General speaking to a Private. A great R (degree of relative imposition associated with the task) is associated with increased use of politeness strategies, as in having to tell an employee her position has been terminated.

As stated, high school disciplinarians are in a dilemma of desiring student acceptance of an 'on-record' assessment of his or her focal behavior as deviant. Having one's behavior assessed as

deviant is a highly face-threatening act (FTA). Brown and Levinson's framework should offer a useful interpretation of how disciplinarians establish a definition of deviance while striving to preserve face. In this framework, individual utterances can be coded and analyzed for the type and degree of face protection used, should help us identify any typical phases and any effects of student responses upon the interactions. From this rationale, the following research questions guided this study:

RQ_1 To what degree do disciplinarians employ negative face-saving strategies?

RQ_2 To what degree do disciplinarians employ positive face-saving strategies?

RQ_3 What phases constitute disciplinary interaction?

RQ_4 What role does the student play in determining the course of the interaction?

Methods

In response to the stated purpose of this study, naturally occurring data was sought. It is assumed here that only such a methodology would best provide insight for the research questions. Five different high schools (in central Illinois) were contacted and asked for the names of their school employees in charge of student discipline. From this initial list of names, six different disciplinarians were asked to record and provide samples of naturally occurring interactions with students. Four disciplinarians representing three schools agreed to participate. The

disciplinarians consisted of two men and two women; two were assistant principals, one was a principal, and one was a dean. They were guaranteed anonymity for themselves and their students. Audio-tape recorders were placed on their desks and they were encouraged to tape as few or as many complete dialogues that they felt comfortable doing. The disciplinarians themselves decided which dialogues to tape and were assured that there was no need to tape conversations of a particularly sensitive nature. Tape recorders were within sight of the students.

Approximately 45 dialogues were generated. Of these, 12 were transcribed in entirety. The transcription style used was that published by Shenkein (1978). Portions of three other dialogues were transcribed and the rest of the 45 were played and reviewed. In transcription, the speakers were labeled A (disciplinarian) and B (student). Fictitious names were used within the dialogue. Male students were called Joseph and females Jenny. Teachers and students referred to were given last names of either, Smith, Hakes, Cole, or Johnson. Each utterance in the transcripts was examined using Brown & Levinson's politeness strategies in order to determine the utterance's function in the negotiating process. Analyzing each transcript, I tallied the frequencies of the occurences (See table 1) Reviewing the resulting interaction patterns, I describe here the data in terms of the different phases in which they occur. From this, I draw inferences to suggest that this data may be representative of other high school disciplinary interactions.

Results

Overview of findings

Nature of school disciplinarian relationship.

The principal; assistant principal, or dean in charge of discipline is the school's ultimate authority on discipline. Students understand this. Behavior defined as deviant within the school (including interaction with other students, teacher, school policies) will often ultimately be settled by this authority. These authorities vary with respect to their perceived 'fairness', 'personableness', 'tolerance' and 'toughness'. Despite such differences in their functioning, these particular high school disciplinarians were granted the right of definition and interpretation over school disciplinary matters.

Evaluations of power (P), social distance (D), and relative degree of imposition (R).

The school disciplinarian is certainly granted power. The high P value over the student would suggest that his or her message to the student would likely lack redress. The social distance between disciplinarian and student is also great. The disciplinarian is distanced from the student in terms of age, maturity, and social status within and outside of the school environment. The perceived intrinsic 'danger' (R factor) of the FTA varies dependent upon the

deviant behavior in question, but would always be present to some degree when one is 'sent to the office'. Within this framework the R factor is the only one by this analysis that would explain any face redress offered by the disciplinarian.

RQ1 *To what degree do high school disciplinarians employ negative face-saving strategies?*

The previous analysis would indicate that these disciplinarians would not put forth much effort toward offering redress to students' negative face wants. My data offers support for this supposition. The disciplinarians studied here didn't spend any time granting students autonomy. They didn't hedge or apologize for their imposition upon the student, as their high P and D factors would indicate:

Dia. 1
55 A: Go back to P.E. right now.

Dia. 2
6 A: Let me see the pass.

These examples illustrate that the degree of the imposition (in light of P, D, and R factors) does not warrant a negotiation of negative politeness.

RQ2 *To what degree do disciplinarians employ positive face-saving strategies?*

Some examples include:

Dia. 8
16 A: (...) likkke I said, hey - I've got nothing against - love - I think its great
17 - but use a little bit of demeanor - there's a time and a place (use of strategy # 7)

Dia. 4
100 A: Okay (1.5) I know I can trust you - you're supposed to be one of my best
101 guys (2.0) right? (use of strategy #15)

Dia. 8
11 A: Its - its okay for getting mad but it is not okay to use obscene language (use of strategy #5)

Dia. 4
33 A: ((student has been sent out of class for eating potatoe chips in class)) you sure
34 you didn't try to eat them cause you were hungry and your stomach was
35 growling? (use of strategy #1)

Dia. 5

32 A: okay but that's it goooodbye sir (use of strategy #4 [address forms])

Several positive politeness strategies appear throughout the data. This indicates a desire by the disciplinarians not only try to lessen face-threat by the use of indirectness, but also by offering positive politeness when on-record which serves to 'soften' the message and support the student's sense of social value.

RQ3 *What phases constitute a disciplinary interaction?*

Two phases were revealed during data analysis. The first phase is a period of negotiation which is flexible in size. The interaction may stay in this phase for varied lengths of time, partially determined by variables to be identified. The second phase

is the on-record assessment of the behavior as deviant. This phase was brief, and occurred in the middle or near the end of the interactions.

Analysis of Phase I - Negotiation

The underlying question answered by this phase is how the disciplinarian goes about getting the student to accept the definition of his behavior as deviant.

Beginning the negotiation: off-record strategies employed.

In the first phase of the interaction, the negotiation about the meaning of the behavior takes place. In getting the student to begin and later to clarify his or her account, the disciplinarian often avoids direct implications and directives if possible. In fact, in all twelve transcribed dialogues, directives and direct implications are avoided at this stage. Going off-record allows for more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held responsible to have committed him or herself to one particular intent (Brown & Levinson 1987-69). Off-record strategies include metaphor and irony, rhetorical questions, understatement, tautologies, all of which are kinds of hints as to what a speaker wants or means to communicate, without dong so directly. The meaning, therefore, is to some degree negotiable. Typical opening utterances to students included:

Dia. 3

1 A: Now I can't, I can't figure this out - uhh you got called in excused for Thursday and Friday and Jenny came in and said that she was with you - cutting Thursday and Friday and she took detention, you want to - go into that a little more with me on how-

2 B: Well, my Dad just excused me - I mean I was with her but-

Dia. 4

1 A: What's up Joseph?

2 B: Uhh - somebody sent me out

Each of these as well as the nine other interactions from my data illustrates how the disciplinarian avoids accusations through use of indirectness. Even in the most indirect cases [like (3)], the student understands the implicature of the utterance as a call for him or her to begin his or her account. In nine out of the twelve dialogues, the students responded to the indirectness (regardless of its form) as a speech act *calling for* an account.

Although the student begins his or her account after the initial off-record inquiry from the disciplinarian, he or she seldom (four out of the twelve) immediately offers the complete account as acceptable to the disciplinarian. Instead, he or she may either focus upon circumstances surrounding the event, including the actions of other agents involved, or offer only vague responses. Examples of vague responses were found in the remaining eight dialogues. In offering vague responses, he or she is protecting his or her face, and setting the stage with reasons, excuses, and justification. With this he or she seemingly tries to minimize the behavior assessment which is being negotiated. For example:

Dia. 5

5 B: he was talk- he was talk'n 'bout yesterday - well - see I had

this piece of wood right? and this other kid said it was his and he was saying that it wasn't mine neither - and I said - okay Mr. Smith - okay you don't believe it's mine - then just forget it I'll make another one - and he said 'fine - then just get to work' and he started getting mouthhy with me - and I was - and he was gett'n annoyed and I said, 'Mr. Smith, okaayy okay - okay ca- calm down' -he was gett'n louder and louder - and then he just said, ((lowers voice)) 'Joseph Hobbs - come here a sec' and so he came in there and he was all loud he was gettin' all loud and-

Dia. 2

B: um I went to up to Miss. Hakes' room and was takin' my quiz and it ran over and she's giv'n me a pass into PE and I done it before only one time but - Mr. Johnson didn't say anything because (he says I'm) unexcused and he said I have to get it excused by you

The student may instead choose the route of offering vague or partial responses, also avoiding (or postponing) face threat. For example:

Dia. 6

A: Okay Joseph, we have uh two things I want to talk to you about the first thing is "A" uh I you owed me two detentions since the fifteenth day of March and you haven't done them how come?

B: When was- my first detention?

Dia. 7

A: You were kicked out of class for saying something bad?

B: yeah

Clarification stage of the negotiation process.

Regardless of how the student begins his or her account, the negotiation phase continues with attempts to clarify the account. Off-record strategies are still used to suggest contradictions or flaws in the student's own account, and to encourage the

development of the account; all efforts to lead the student toward acceptance of the definition of his or her behavior as deviant. For example:

Dia. 3

A: Uh, I've got a little pro-blem here I want to discuss with you - you wanna close the door. ((door shuts)) Now I can't figure this out - uh you got called in excused for Thursday and Friday and Jenny came in and said that she was with you - cutting Thursday and Friday and she took detention. You wanna - go in to that a little more with me on how (2.0)

B: Well my Dad just excused me - I mean I was with her but=

A: =so then you're not excused?

B: Not really - I guess

A: What do you mean you guess - if she if if you were cutting school how can you be excused?

After the initial off-record inquiry in lines 1 through 5, the student begins her account with the vague answer of "well my dad just excused me." But when she confesses that she was with Jenny, the disciplinarian (in line 7) immediately points out her apparent contradiction with the indirect accusation, "so then you're not excused?" Phrasing it as a question serves to distance the disciplinarian from an on-record accusation. In line 8, the student, bound to her previous words, then admits "not really", but then softens her bald admission by the hedge, "I guess". Closer to reaching agreement of the behavior as deviant, the disciplinarian confronts her hedge with a rhetorical question (line 9) utilizing the words he has gotten her to accept thus far.

B: (pause) That's true - but her mom didn't excuse her but my dad did cause I had some problems to work out.

14 A: Did the problems have anything to do with Jenny or why should Jenny
15 get burnt for 2 days and you not?

After pausing a moment, the student admits that she had indeed skipped but then offers a justification for her behavior which would remove its definition of deviance (in line 12). The disciplinarian then confronts her reference to "some problems" and poses the rhetorical question in line line 14 which further points toward deviant behavior.

16 B: I don't know she ch- she's her own person she chose too (pause)

17 A: So you felt it was okay that you could cut for two days. She said that you
18 just basically - just messed around for 2 days it wasn't any problems, you know

The student in line 16 doesn't have an adequate reply so seems to be searching for a new avenue of excuse until cut off by the disciplinarian in line 17. Here he again goes off-record by appearing to be merely acknowledging what she has admitted. He then offers evidence in a matter-of-fact manner in lines 17 &18. By offering the overwhelming evidence, the deviance of her behavior is strongly implied, but not directly stated.

19 B: ((pause)) I don't know I mean - see I have an English paper - that was due
20 - and I haven't really done any of it - and I've talked to my - English teacher
21 about it and told her I'd been hav'n problems with it - and its generally most of
22 my grade its (its so and so) that's why - I was gone - . hhhhhbasically - but I
was
23 afraid=

24 A: =But Jenny said you two were just cruisin around and messin around for
the
25 two days (1.5) How in the heck - you cruisin' around and messin' around for two
26 days how did that help with the English paper?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

27 B: It didn't that's the thing ((lainlty)) it didn't help at all, it was stupid.

Again the student (in lines 19 through 23) was unable to refute the evidence but was still unwilling to admit the definition of deviance. She paused and appeared to be formulating a new account of justification. Her reply was delivered in pieces which is likely to represent the way it was slowly being pulled together in her mind (Chafe 1979). She finally delivered an account which justified her missing of school by her desire to do well on a school assignment. Before finishing, the disciplinarian repeated the mutually-accepted evidence and delivered another off-record accusation through a rhetorical question. Its only at this point that the student realized her justifications were not able to refute the assessment of deviance.

In line 27 she admits that skipping school didn't help her paper and finally is the first one to put on-record the label of deviance to her behavior by referring to it as "stupid." As soon as this definition is offered, the negotiation is finished. This dialogue, although unusual in the high number of clarification exchanges, exemplifies the negotiation process undergone in eleven of the twelve transcribed dialogues.

Analysis of Phase II - On-record assessment of deviant behavior:

Despite the amount of time spent, positive redress offered, and indirectness used in the negotiation phase, the disciplinarians

displayed a desire to get a bald on-record assessment of the behavior as deviant. If the students failed to arrive at the definition by him or herself, then the disciplinarians seemed to reach a point where he or she terminated the negotiation and stated it him or herself. The on-record assessment is needed to justify the preceding or following 'sentence' or punishment. Of the twelve transcribed dialogues analyzed, ten resulted with the behavior being considered deviant by the disciplinarian. In eight of these ten cases, the disciplinarian delivered the on-record assessment of deviance. In five out of these eight instances, the student eventually vocalized acceptance of the definition of deviance. The two instances where the disciplinarians didn't offer a bald on-record assessment of deviance were marked by the student being the first to offer a definition of his or her behavior as deviant. These bald on-record assessments by disciplinarians and students that did occur happened either in the middle of the dialogue (in seven out of the ten times) or at the end (in three of the ten times), but never at the beginning.

RQ4 *What role does the student play in determining the course of the interaction?*

Role of the student in the interaction

As brought out in the analysis of negotiation, the student plays a vital role in determining the path of the interaction. He or she may instead rely on the cooperative principle of communication (Grice 1975). Through the flouting of the four Gricean Maxims, (Relevance, Manner, Quantity, and Quality) he or she can rely on conversational implicature to convey his or her message indirectly to a cooperative

hearer without going on-record. One disciplinarian involved in this study acknowledged that to a great degree, the student determines the course of the interaction. If the student is cooperative, then the disciplinarian will be cooperative, but if the student 'wants to make it difficult', then he said he is much 'tougher' with him. My data indicated that this was true for most of the interactions.

When the student is communicating cooperatively.

The word, 'cooperatively' here does not refer to whether or not student immediately complies and accepts the assessment of deviance. Instead, it refers to whether or not the student accepts/acknowledges the implicature offered through off-record indirectness. Case-in-point would be example 3 (dispute over unexcused absence) analyzed above to illustrate the negotiation process. Even though the student was denying the label of deviance toward her behavior, she was communicating cooperatively with the disciplinarian. She accepted his off-record statements to imply what he intended, and responded accordingly. For example, in line 9, the disciplinarian poses the rhetorical question, "*if she if if you were cutting school how can you be excused?*" An uncooperative reply might have been one that ignored the intended meaning of the utterance, instead responding to the literal one, and offering some answer to the rhetorical question. In interactions where the student is communicating 'cooperatively', the disciplinarians generally continued to offer off-record utterances. They continued until either the student stated the behavior on-record as deviant, or until it appeared that the student (although communicating

cooperatively) would not accept the definition him or herself. For example:

Dia. 9

30 A: =argumentative and rude - disruptive - etc. - then these are things=
31 B: [uh huhh [hmm huh

32 A: =things you have to cease doing

33 B: (3.0) ((softly)) uhhkay, but - uhm I don't I don't see myself as doing
34 those things I didn't say a word

35 A: maybe a good thing to do would be to go back and apologize to Mr. Smith -
36 okay - is that agreeable?

37 B: okay

Even though the student, in line 31, is being cooperative (acknowledging the disciplinarians comments), and, in line 33, is communicating cooperatively (responding to indirectness as indended), she refuses to accept the definition of her behavior as deviant. The disciplinarian in this case, and in other similar ones, realizes that the negotiating isn't leading to the student's admission, so stops the negotiation with the delivery of the 'punishment'. The phrasing of the punishment with hedges and even some negative politeness (line 35) indicates that the disciplinarian is trying to help the student save face. Perhaps it is because she appears to honestly not agree with the assessment of the referral and the fact that she has been cooperative with the disciplinarian.

This particular example of dialogue has proven to be one of my greatest points of interest within this entire project. Although further analysis of it may be tangental here, subsequent discussion is offered in an epilogue.

When the student is both communicating cooperatively *and* accepting the definition of his behavior as deviant, the disciplinarians in this study tended to continue with their discipline message to get it on-record. They also, however, seemed to make an effort to offer positive politeness. For example:

Dia. 10

14 B: I kissed her on the cheek

15 A: ((softly)) Okay I'm just saying - personally I have nothing against love
16 but there's a time and a place
[[
17 B: okay okay

18 A: Okay?

19 B: Okay

20 A: Now like I said you're good people Joe - lets lets
[
21 B: alright
[
22 A: yeah okay uh save it
23 for the right time and place

The student admits the behavior in line 14 without any excuse or justification. The disciplinarian then softens his voice noticably and states: (line 15) "*okay I'm just saying*", and strategy #7 (See appendix #1 for complete list of strategies), in which he asserts the common ground of also liking the emotion 'love' to redress the on-record statement of there being a "*time*" *and a place.*" The student is offering agreement with his inserting of "*okay* " and "*alright* " in several places while the disciplinarian is speaking. These may also be attempts to truncate the disciplinarian's message and further save his own face. Even though the disciplinarian decides to continue delivering the on-record assessment, he adds further

positive face redress to the student with line 20. Here he uses the strategy of 'giving gifts to hearer' (strategy #15), which is in this case the acknowledgement of 'Joe' as *good people*. On the heels of this redress comes the on-record imperative of "save it for the right time and place".

When the student is communicatively uncooperative.

As might intuitively be guessed, disciplinarians tended to stop using off-record face-saving strategies when students refused to cooperate and respond to the implicature. Of the twelve dialogues where disciplinarians began the negotiations with indirectness, only two dialogues included students who were communicatively uncooperative. In both of these instances, the disciplinarians stopped the indirectness and went on-record with a direct assessment of the behavior as deviant. For example:

Dia. 8

2	A:	Do you wann tell me what happened?
3	B:	*She caught me on fire!*
4	A:	(2.5) annnd?
5	B:	uhh! got mad! (1.5) how'd you like it if someone cau-
6	A:	[annnnd?
7	B:	*and* what?
8	A:	and what did you do?
9	B:	(1.0) *I got mad* - and then he try to take me out for getting mad
10	A:	uhkay - its okay for getting mad but it is not okay to use obscene language in class

As typical of the dialogues in this data, the disciplinarian here began by using non-accusational off-record strategies in order to allow the student to assess his behavior. When the student answered with only part of the account (he left out the part which surrounded his own behavior), the disciplinarian simply replied *"annnnd?"*, which clearly flouts the Gricean maxim of quantity. In other words, the simple repeating of the conjunction 'and' is a violation of Grice's quantity principle as in itself it has no meaning. Being a violation of the quantity principle, a cooperative listener would therefore look for and respond to a non-literal meaning which in this case is a prod to continue his account. The student, however, (perhaps wanting to avoid the face-threatening part of the account: his behavior) chose to not follow the implicature as intended, but rather as a call to serve his own means. In line 5, he simply took the *"annnd?"* as a chance to elaborate on the injustice imposed upon him. The disciplinarian stopped him in this pursuit and posed the indirect question one more time, as a second chance to discuss his behavior. Again, the student refused, and implied, in line 7, that he had no idea what else she could possibly want to know. At this point, the disciplinarian became less indirect by indicating that she was referring to his behavior (in line 8) with *and what did **you** do?* The student still continued to avoid the face-threatening discussion of his specific behavior, and in line 9, the student replied the most general way that the indirectness of the question allowed. After the disciplinarian could see that the student was not going to address the deviant behavior, she went on record with line 10. Only after the student refused the invitation to address it first, did the

disciplinarian go on-record by assessing his use of obscene language as deviant behavior.

Students who became uncooperative and/or communicatively uncooperative also tended to receive less positive face redress and more coersive appeals (warnings, threats, etc.)

Dia. 9

36 A: and I hope things go better in her class

37 B: maybe, I don't know

38 A: Well if they don't you might be down a lot more than what I'm gonna
39 have you do tomorrow (2.5) maybe we should call the parents now and have as
40 little meeting - would you like that?

41 B: I don't care

42 A: then I'm gonna request that you uh tell them to come in with you or you don't come back to school is that what you'd like?

The off-record warning in line 36 is interpreted correctly by the student who challenges it in line 37. The off-record warning in lines 38 through 40 are also met with an uncooperative response in line 37. The escalating pattern established by the student's refusal to be cooperative resulted in more warnings and imperatives.

Discussion

Analyzing data from this study of high school disciplinary interactions has pointed toward some interesting findings. Accepting an assessment of one's behavior as deviant presents a face-threatening situation. The disciplinarians represented in this data, without exception, made attempts to minimize this threat. Brown and Levinson's theoretical framework of face protection

offered insight as to kinds and degrees of face protection strategies employed. Grice's notion of cooperative communication provided a basis for evaluating students responses to the indirectness.

The model presented here includes a negotiation phase. This phase consists of off-record attempts by the disciplinarian to get the student to accept an assessment of his behavior as deviant. Within this negotiation (and entire encounter) are woven several positive politeness strategies which serve to assure the social value of the student. Negative politeness strategies was scarcely seen, as the dynamics of the disciplinarian/student relationship doesn't typically warrant them. This model illustrates how the student often plays a vital role in the degree to which the disciplinarian will incorporate politeness strategies. Cooperative students received more off-record strategies and more positive-face redress. Uncooperative students tended to receive more coersive utterances along with less indirectness and positive-face redress.

These findings seem to find a compromise between Chapman's (1981) and Bell's (1977) conceptions of prior goals determining discipline strategies versus the bidirectional notion of child responses effecting adult strategies. These disciplinarians all seemed to possess the goals of using indirectness strategies to preserve the students' 'face' needs, while negotiating a definition of focal behavior as deviant. Yet, their indirectness patterns showed signs of changing due to either student cooperativeness or uncooperativeness.

Subsequent studies should examine the cultural relationship of student and high school disciplinarians. The P, D, and R factors of the dyad seem to suggest that principals and deans wouldn't need to offer much politeness in delivering the face-threatening messages. This evaluation might imply that principals would quickly deliver an assessment of the behavior as deviant and give the punishment. But the data clearly proves this isn't the case. This study doesn't offer an explanation of *why* this is so. Future research might examine the goals or objectives that motivate disciplinarians to follow the described model. Further, given the degree of control a student appears to have, it would be useful to examine how students use that control and how individual differences (e.g. maturity, cognitive complexity, gender, etc.) affect use of control. Finally, similar disciplinary interactions should be further explored using different dialogues generated from different disciplinarians to test the proposed model's generalizability.

Epilogue

The purpose of this study was to analyze natural dialogue in order to assess the use of 'face-saving' strategies employed by disciplinarians with their students. Patterns of interaction were sought, as well as influences students may have had upon the negotiation process. After completion of the project, one dialogue continuted to trouble me. In Dialogue # 9 (discussed on page 19), a female minority student is interacting with a white, school administrator. The student and disciplinarian are not agreeing upon the assessment of her behavior. The disciplinarian was not a witness to the behavior in question, so is depending upon the written notes offered on the teacher's referral. The student is operating from her recollection of the context in which her behavior was met with a reprimand. The brief referral note becomes the text of which the truth value is being debated. The disciplinarian appears to accept the few scribbled words "argumentative and rude - disruptive - etc." as the 'true' or 'real' description of her behavior, which would then justify discipline.

The student listens to the disciplinarian's assessment. After a pause, however, she quietly asserts that she doesn't see her behavior as fitting the referral's (and now the disciplinarian's) assessment.

Valerie Walkerdine (1985) argued that if a child complies willingly within a parent-child disciplinary interaction then

> his self-esteem can be kept intact: but whenever he is forced into an unwilling compliance by the threat of sanctions, whether these be pain inflicted or approval withdrawl, he will inevitably suffer in some degree feelings of powerlessness and humilation.

The same likely holds with the school setting. In this specific example; the studetn was forced into an unwilling compliance as seen in lines 35-37, where the disciplinarian ignores the student's defense and suggests that she go apologize (and hence admit guilt). Her reply is a defeated, "okay."

Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) assess the broader problem in education of students whose gender, race, and class distinctions place them within a position of being on the 'border' of a long-time conceptualized 'legitimate center.' Students in the 'border' have long faced serious conflicts between values and practices learned at home and those valorized (and/or punished) at school. Centered to their conception of a 'border pedagogy' is the need to point to ways in which those master narratives based on white, patriarchical, and class-specific versions of the world can and need to be challenged. Building on Foucault (1977a), they argue that the discourses of democracy and difference can be taken up as pedagogical practices through 'counter memory.' Counter memory represents a critical reading of how the past informs the present and how the present informs the past. Following Aronowitz and Giroux, counter memory as a pedagogical practice, "attempts to alter oppressive relations of power and to educate both teachers and students to the ways in which they might be complecitous with dominant power relations,

victimized by them, and how they might be able to transform relations."

This analysis doesn't suggest that, as in the present example, the description on the teacher's referral should be ignored over the student's self-assessment. Recognizing obvious problems with this, Aronowitz and Giroux write that

> it is not enough for teachers merely to affirm uncritically their students' histories, experiences, and stories. To take student voices at face value is to run the risk of idealizing and romanticizing them. The contradictory and complex histories and stories that give meaning to the lives of students are never innocent, and it is important that they be recognized for their contradictions as well as for their possibilities. Of course, it is crucial that critical educators provide the pedagogical conditions for students to give voice to how their past and present experiences place them within existing relations of domination and resistance. Central to this pedagogical process is the important task of affirming the voices that students bring to school, and challenging the separation of school knowledge from the experience of everyday life.

Although not the first to do so, this project has reaffirmed the existence of discrepencies between school administration (teachers, disciplinarians) and students from non-dominant cultures who face daily confict between accepted (and encouraged) behavior at home and that permitted at home. To prevent what Walkerdine (1985) referred to as feelings of "powerlessness and humilation," educators may need to look further that handwritten words on a referral before judging students.

Appendix #1

Claim common ground

Strategy #1 Notice, attend to H (hearer)
Strategy #2 Exaggerate (his interest, approval, wants, needs, goods)
Strategy #3 Intensify interest to H
Strategy #4 Use in-group identify markers
- -address forms
- -use of jargon or slang
- -contraction
- -use of in-group language or dialect

Strategy #5 Seek agreement
Strategy #6 Avoid disagreement
- -Token agreement
- -Pseudo-agreement
- -White lies
- -Hedging opinions

Strategy #7 Presuppose/raise/assert common ground
- -Gossip
- -Point-of-view operations
- -Personal-centre switch: S to H
- -Time switch
- -Place switch
- -Avoidance of adjustment of reports to H's point of view
- -Presupposition manipulations
- -Presuppose knowledge of H's wants and attitudes
- -Presuppose H's familiarity in S-H relationship
- -Presuppose H's knowledge

Strategy #8 Joke

Convey that S and H are cooperators

Strategy #9 Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants
Strategy #10 Offer, promise
Strategy #11 Be optimistic
Strategy #12 Include both S and H in the activity (i.e. What should *we* do about it?)
Strategy #13 Give reasons
Strategy #14 Assume or assert reciprocity

fulfil H's want for some X

Strategy #15 Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

References

Aronowitz, S., and Giroux, H., (1991). Border pedogogy in the age of postmodernism. In Postmodern Education. Minneapolis.

*Bell, R.Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. Psychological Review, 75, 81-95.

Bell, R.Q. (1971). Stimulus control of parent or caretaker behavior by offspring. Developmental Psychology, 4, 63-72.

Bell, R.Q. (1974). Contributions of human infants to caregiving and social interaction. In M. Lewis & L. A. Rosenblum (Eds.) The effect of the infant on its caregiver (pp. 1-19). New York: Wiley.

Bell, R.Q. (1977). Socialization findings reexamined. In R. Q. Bell & L. V. Harper (Eds.), Child effects on adults (pp. 53-84). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Boivin, R & Hammond, J. (1988). Administering the school discipline policy need not be overwhelming. In National association of secondary school principals. (Jan. pp. 4-9).

Brown, P. and Levinson, Steven C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Burke, J.A. (1986). Interacting plans in the accomplishment of a practical activity. In D.G. Ellis and W.A. Donohue (Eds.), Contemporary issues in language and discourse processes (pp. 203-222) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brunk, Molly A., and Heggeler, Scott W. (1984). Child influences on adult controls: An experimental investigation. Developmental Pscychology. 20 (pp. 1074-1081)

Calabreses, R.L., (1985). The principal and school discipline: An alternative. In National association of secondary school principals. (69 pp. 98-100)

Chafe, W.L. (1979). The flow of thought and the flow of language. In Syntax and semantics, Vol. 12: Discourse and syntax. (pp. 159-182). New York: Academic

Chapman, M. (1981). Listening to reason: Children's attentiveness and parental discipline. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 25 (pp.251-263).

Chapman, M. & Zahn-Waxler (1981). Young children's compliance and noncompliance to parental discipline in a natural setting. In International journal of behavioral delelopment. 5 (pp. 88-94)

Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.) Syntax and semantics, vol. 3: speech acts. (pp. 41-58) New York: Academic.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grusec, J.E. & Kyczynski, L. (1980). Direction of effects in socialization: A comparison of the parent's versus the child's behavior as determinants of disciplinary techniques. In Developmental Psychology. (16 pp. 1-9).

Mitchell, Joe M., ( ). Advise from a Principal: The assistant principal as detective. In National association of secondary school principals. (Oct. pp. 39-41).

Portes, P.R., Dunham, R., & Williams, S. (1986). Assessing child-rearing styles in ecological settings: Its relation to culture, social class, early age intervention, and scholastic achievment. In Adolescence (21 pp. 723-35) Libra Publishers

Scott, M. & Lyman S. (1968). Accounts. American Sociological Review (33 pp. 46-62)

Smith, Thomas E. (1983). Adolescent reaction to attempted parental control and influence techniques. In Journal of marriage and the family. (Aug. pp. 533-543)

Walkerdine, V., (1985) On the realization of speaking and silence: Subjectivity, class, and gender in contemporary schoolong. In Steedman's (Ed.) Language, gender, and childhood. Routlege, Boston.